



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	<i>Application No.</i>	09/741,881
	<i>Filing Date</i>	22 December 2000
	<i>First Named Inventor</i>	Norman G. ANDERSON
	<i>Group Art Unit</i>	1641
	<i>Examiner Name</i>	Kartic Padmanabhan
	<i>Attorney Docket No.</i>	2316-143
<i>Title of the Invention:</i> RAPID PARTICLE DETECTION		

#14
1/13/03
NW

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
JAN 09 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 18, 2002, the Applicant selects Group I, claims 1 through 10, with traverse for further prosecution on the merits.

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 10 and 19 through 27 remain pending in the application. The restriction requirement is traversed. Reconsideration of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

The Office Action asserts that Groups I and II are unrelated, since they require different elements. It is submitted respectfully, however, that merely having different elements is not among the criteria listed in either M.P.E.P. §§ 806.04 or 808.01 that were cited in the Office Action.

Furthermore, since the at least two different immobilized binding agents required by the claims of Group II are not required by the claims of Group I, as noted by the Office Action, a search for a single immobilized binding agent amounts to a lesser